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MEMORANDUM FOR: HR. HALDEMAN
RESPONSE TO HRH MEMO OF 6/12/72

The original PJB/KK memo omitted many of the items HRH mentioned only because it focused on the assault strategy rather than the tone of the total campaign. The following should be thought of as the addendum which brings our original memo to logical extensions of the attack.

1. We agree that the Nixon strength ought to be kept front and center and that our lines of attack should end up emphasizing our own strengths. We understand the Administration record has been written up and will go out to our people along with the McGovern attack books. Instructions should be that these two go hand in hand.

But the technique of how this is done is almost as important as the substance itself. Comparing RN's record with McGovern's ought to be done in the starkest possible terms, matching our best with his worst. E.g., "When Richard Nixon fought Congress to keep America number one in aerospace and to keep Lockheed and Boeing workers on the job, George McGovern voted to throw them out of work and see the United States recede to second-best in a crucial industry." "While Richard Nixon has pressed for three years to reform our welfare system, George McGovern answers with a $1000 per person giveaway plan which requires no one to find a job while soaking the middle-class taxpayer with more taxes."
Right down the line on the issues, Hoover, amnesty, pot, abortion, defense, etc., McGovern's gross stupidity can be made graphic when matched appropriately against RN's position.

We would be concerned, however, that RN be dragged by comparison into some of the assault efforts. Care should be taken that McGovern is not elevated by comparison with RN or that RN is dragged down by same. In some cases it will be best to list the long bill of particulars finishing up with only a brief standard recitation of the RN strengths. The whole rationale of negative attack is to belittle McGovern to the point that the contrast is obvious.

2. The second point in HRH's memorandum raises important questions on McGovern's "new face" versus the "establishment" RN. We don't feel that we can finesse this one simply by saying RN has provided dozens of new initiatives -- we have hammered on this for two years with very little impact. Rather than try to force the idea that RN can out new-face McGovern, we must tarnish the McGovern image of the new face.

This strategy must be part of an overall strategy which brings us to a decision as to how we want to campaign vis 'a vis the 92nd Congress. In other words, while McGovern attacks the political establishment, we must forcefully get the point across that he is part and parcel of the so-called establishment and has been so for 16 years. Here's where the decision has to be made on whether or not to run against Congress.
For the last twenty years, Congress has been controlled by the Democratic party. For 14 of those years George McGovern has been a member of Congress. For 14 years, George McGovern did nothing to reform the tax structure. He waited for an election year. For 14 years, George McGovern and his party did nothing to diminish the amount of government control over our lives; to the contrary, he voted constantly to expand big government. And now he waits for an election year to campaign against "impersonal government." For 14 years, George McGovern could have done all the things that he accuses RN of not doing -- but he didn't. George McGovern does not urge passage of welfare reform; he doesn't support passage of reorganizing a government that's too big; he's done nothing to help seek passage of revenue sharing which could ease the property tax burden on millions of Americans; he has not stumped the country urging support for RN's volunteer army, etc. ad nauseum.

This point is but a part of a larger point about the Democratic party; the point Broder and Drummond have made in their columns. The Democrats have controlled the Presidency 28 out of the last 40 years and Congress 36 out of the last 40 years. After the appalling record of their control, and George McGovern's part as a leader of his party, it is pure gall for him to campaign around as a new face.
Only after a ripping attack on the very basic failures of McGovern and his colleagues in Congress, can we then point out that RN has done more than any other President to bring institutional revolution to an inert mass. However, I strongly advise against trying to portray RN as a sleek corvette when he is really a damned dependable Buick. It will be easier to prove that McGovern is not the corvette, but rather a Great Society Cadillac in for a tune-up.

3. Foreign policy issues were not totally ignored, and we are in agreement that foreign policy will be an RN long-suit in the campaign. We wish to point out something else along these lines that is being missed in many of the analyses we've seen. Namely, McGovern is still largely a one-issue candidate -- i.e., his candidacy is resting to a high degree on the quicksand of Vietnam. The New York Times/Yankelovich survey of the California primary showed that two-thirds of the Democrat voters believed the Vietnam war to be the most important public issue, and that McGovern won heavy support from those who thought so. The Hart Research Associates poll for the Post also showed that two-thirds of the people voting for McGovern cited Vietnam among the reasons for doing so.

Thus Vietnam continues to be a central issue in a McGovern/RN contest. We feel that some decision here will be detrimental to McGovern -- nearly a death blow. But beyond Vietnam, there are a large number of foreign policy concerns that will help RN. Israel is one. Our people have to know that McGovern is soft on this issue, and
can be hurt. As we pointed out, his defense proposal is one place to hit him on Israel. The Rabin statement should be carefully noted for future use. Some heavy Jewish support ought to be ready and willing to go out after McGovern on this point.

We especially wish to give strong recommendation to one particular idea. The Jordanian crisis continues to be a big zero in the public's mind. The campaign is when we need to surface it again. We recommend that an excellent documentary film be made (half-hour) which re-creates the total situation -- including footage of our carriers being moved in the Med, situation room activity, RN's personal participation, footage of RN visiting with the jetliner hostages, etc. This should be a film story which matches the Fletcher Knebel books in suspense; and the best thing about it is that it's true. We need to give it dramatic life. Showing that film in areas of heavy Jewish voters won't hurt us a bit against "strip-the-Sixth-Fleet McGovern."

We totally agree that RN's superior foreign policy capabilities ought to be given prominent attention, but it ought not be linked completely to McGovern. Rather the approach should be to denigrate McGovern -- the lightweight who has probably negotiated nothing more than an auto loan in his lifetime. Nice, decent McGovern against Mr. Chou and the dour Brezhnev. To help in this, we need to get a lot of heavies who will make fun of his proposal to strip our NATO forces
unilaterally, to call his lack of understanding of how SALT was negotiated a joke, to simply portray him as a South Dakota hick whose blitherings over the Vietnam war aren't going to serve him well when the hot line warms up.

4. We agree that our attacks should not surface the enemy line, and that our own points need to be surfaced in the attack. This point was covered basically in number 1 above. However, the thing about McGovern is that the enemy line is a bunch of crap, and surfacing it is precisely what we want to do -- McGovern being the unknown quantity that he is. The enemy line of a $1000 to every thing that breathes is something we want to point out, ditto on abortion, defense and the others. What we do want to avoid is the following type of thing: "McGovern says that RN is a cold warrior, and I say he's not." Anyone who can't distinguish between the arguments should not be out speaking for us. Since we will be monitoring much of this, we can make sure it is avoided.

5. Building the foreign policy issue is of great urgency. There are two approaches. The first is simply a strong pro-RN line.

Here is the man who has spent 25 years in public life; has parlayed that experience into a deftness on foreign policy which has never been matched by any President; has led him to successful negotiations drawing the world nearer to peace; skillfully dealt with an unpopular war that he inherited and won the peace without losing the war. In short,
this is the line that shows RN to be the quintessential statesman.

Putting out this line forcefully almost removes the need to make
the comparison with McGovern -- McGovern could be dispatched
in about one paragraph.

The second line is focused on McGovern. What would George
McGovern have said to Leonid Brezhnev during SALT. "Mr. Brezhnev,
I agree with the Politburo's position that the Vietnam war is a disaster,
now what concessions may I give you?" We would point out that
George McGovern has never been involved in one single important
foreign policy decision in his lifetime; that he could not be treated
as an equal by one big-power leader in the world; that his foreign
policy propositions are major reversals of virtually the entire
American foreign policy apparatus. As President, he would
convulse international relations, destroy the NATO alliance,
forsake the whole of Asia, etc.

There is but one caveat on the McGovern foreign policy
argument. He may well try to turn this into an asset. E.g., "It's
time we turn our attention to America. I agree with Mr. Nixon's Moscow
and Peking diplomacy, but now that we've settled that, elect a
man who is willing to feed our own hungry children as well as the
children of foreign countries." He can demagogue against us on this
point, and we need to be on the lookout for it. We may have to give
him a little of the same treatment in return.
MEMORANDUM FOR: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN
FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

McGovern knows damn good and well that we have enough material on him to sink a battleship. He also knows that we won't be afraid to use this information, and that it will damage him highly. Thus, his strategy will be, among other things, to obfuscate the issues around personality. To wit, he and his people will try to shrug off the attacks by yelling "smear," "hatchet job," "Tricky Dick" -- the works.

This has already been promised by Mankiewicz and the first evidence of it came over the weekend. After Herb Stein's low-keyed assault on the McGovern tax and welfare schemes, McGovern released a statement saying the following about the Stein appraisal:

"He called the attack 'the opening shot of this year's campaign against me,' and said: 'Nixon obviously realizes that this year's Presidential campaign is going to be waged primarily over the rampant unemployment, inflation, economic uncertainty and favoritism which now burden this country.'"

"The attack, he said, 'tipped his (Nixon's) hand that he is going to try to cover up with the kind of political hatchet work which has characterized every campaign he has ever run.'" New York Times 6/19/72

This has been an enormously successful tool of the Democrats, and they will use it with gusto. I have some suggestions to counter it.

-- We have to start, very soon, using the very same tactic. I.e., we need to have our people accuse McGovern of doing hatchet work, accuse him of divisiveness, of polarization -- and we have the quotes to back it up. Our use of this should be relentless in order not to let McGovern get away with using it first. There is no reason why we shouldn't be the "hurt" party. It didn't do RN any damage in 1966.
As soon as things begin in earnest, any time McGovern makes national news with such accusations, we ought to be right on top of it and have Scott, Rockefeller, and others try to get on t.v. immediately refuting it -- backed up with some well-documented examples of McGovern demagogy.

-- This whole business reinforces the necessity that our attacks be not at all strident, but simply factual. The only thing McGovern will be smeared with is hard fact.

-- Finally, let's hold in reserve to the very end of the campaign the possibility of a major speech by RN -- only if the election appears to be close and only if the smear argument seems to be catching. That speech would be a point by point refutation (Checkers style) of the McGovern argument -- one which catalogues the whole series of smears against the President (this is being compiled by Research, as you know). Let's not jump the gun on this one, but let's hold the idea in reserve if needed.
MEMORANDUM TO: KEN KHACHIGIAN
FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

Thimmesch has the pro-abortion statements of McGovern--and can we get that ad that was run in the Catholic papers of Nebraska on abortion, McGovern's position.

Further, I understand that in Nebraska McGovern indicated that he would name Ramsey Clark, the Berrigan Defender, as the FBI Chief. Can we check this out and get it -- if possible. Can you give my brother Bill a call and ask him where he heard it, if you can't get it from the Nebraska press.

Finally, understand from the News Summary that Alger Hiss has endorsed George McGovern. Can we get that one nailed down also.

Buchanan